





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,463	03/29/2004	Thomas J. Foster	H10357/JDP	3160
1333 7590 01/24/2008 EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY PATENT LEGAL STAFF			EXAMINER	
			EBRAHIMI DEHKORD, SAEID	
343 STATE STREET ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1001135121			2625	
				<u> </u>
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ŗ.		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/812,463	FOSTER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKore				
Daried 6	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap					
Period fo	• •	LVIC CET TO EVDIDE (MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (20) DAVE			
WHI0 - External after af	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMU .136(a). In no event, however, may d will apply and will expire SIX (6) No ute, cause the application to become	NICATION. y a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3)[3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	4) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ier.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•				
44)[]	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	•				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	examiner. Note the attack	ned Office Action or form P1O-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	ın priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	All b) Some * c) None of:	•	•			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•	en received in this National Stage			
* 1	application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	•	not received			
•	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies i	iot received.			
			MEN 1/			
Attachmen	• •	. 🗖 .				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Info	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		of Informal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number:

10/812,463 Art Unit: 2625

7

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Pub 20040190029. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention discloses in the instant application and the claims in the patent are obvious variant over each other. For example the limitation "defining each pixel as either a background pixel, interior pixel, or an edge pixel" is mapped to the "defining each pixel as either a background pixel, interior pixel, or an edge pixel" of the Pup application 20040190029, and also the limitation of "reassigning the digital value of one or more edge pixels or interior pixel independently" maps to the the limitation of "reassigning the digital value of one or more edge pixel, interior pixel to the lower value indepentley" of the Pub application 20040199029

Application/Control Number:

10/812,463 Art Unit: 2625 Page 3

3. Claims 2-24 are also obvious variant over claims 2-29 or the Pub application 20040190029.

Contact information

10/812,463

Art Unit: 2625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy whose telephone number is 703-306-3487. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri,8:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Saeid Ebrahimi Patent Examiner Group Art Unit 2625

January 18, 2008